

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-38 are now pending. Claims 1, 2, 3, 11, 12, 34, and 35 are now amended. The claim amendments are fully supported by the application as filed and do not present new subject matter. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugimoto et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,777,610). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claims 1, 2, 3, 11, 12, 34, and 35 are now amended.

Claims 1, 2, 11, 34, and 35 are each amended to generally recite, in part and with reference to Figure 2 for exemplary purposes only as the invention includes numerous embodiments, a driver integrated circuit 27, 28, 31, mounted on a glass substrate 23 by chip on glass (COG) mounting.

Claims 3 and 12 are now amended to recite, in part and with reference to Figure 2 for exemplary purposes only as the invention includes numerous embodiments, a scanning driver integrated circuit 31 connected to scanning electrodes 26. The scanning driver integrated circuit 31 is mounted on the first extended area 24A by chip on glass (COG) mounting. Claims 3 and 12 further recite a data-signal driver integrated circuit 27-28 connected to data-signal electrodes 25. The data-signal driver integrated circuit is mounted on a second extended area 23A by chip on glass (COG) mounting.

The Sugimoto et al. reference appears to disclose, with reference to Figures 4 and 5, driver integrated circuits 15 and 16 mounted to flexible wiring boards 13 and 19 respectively. The driver integrated circuits are not mounted on an extended area of the

glass substrate 11B by chip on glass (COG) mounting, as generally set forth in amended independent Claims 1, 2, 3, 11, 12, 34 and 35. In the Response to Amendment section of the Office Action, the Examiner correctly states that the wiring board 19 overlaps the substrate 11B. However, the wiring board 19 is different from the driver IC 16 of Sugimoto et al. and the driver IC as claimed. The Sugimoto et al. reference fails to suggest a driver integrated circuit mounted on a glass substrate by chip on glass mounting, as set forth in amended Claims 1, 2, 3, 11, 12, 34 and 35.

The Sugimoto et al. reference also fails to suggest a number of other features of the amended independent claims. For example, the claims generally recite a circuit board 22 that overlaps the glass substrate. Sugimoto et al. appears to disclose a circuit board 14. However, the circuit board 14 is spaced apart from the glass substrate 11 and does not overlap the glass substrate 11 as claimed. The Office Action correctly states that the wiring board 19 overlaps the substrate, but the wiring board 19 is different from the claimed circuit board 22 and the circuit board 14 of Sugimoto et al. The Sugimoto et al. reference fails to suggest positioning its circuit board 22 such that it overlaps the glass substrate 11, as set forth in the amended independent claims.

The independent claims also recite that the circuit board 22 is a flexible circuit board. The Sugimoto et al. reference fails to suggest making its circuit board 14 flexible as claimed. The Office Action correctly states that the wiring board 19 of Sugimoto et al. is flexible, however, the wiring board 19 is different from the circuit board 14 and the circuit board as claimed. The Sugimoto et al. reference fails to suggest making its circuit board 14 a flexible circuit board as claimed.


As set forth above, the Sugimoto et al. reference fails to suggest each and every feature of amended independent Claims 1, 2, 3, 11, 12, 34 and 35. Therefore, the Sugimoto et al. reference fails to render obvious the amended independent claims as well as those claims dependent therefrom. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this Section 103 rejection.

#### CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 28, 2005

By:   
G. Gregory Schivley, Reg. No. 27,382  
Bryant E. Wade, Reg. No. 40,344

Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600  
GGS/BEW/BGS/les